



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/087,384	03/01/2002	Cherita Arnece Peppers	16356.686 (DC-03130)	3346
27683	7590	06/30/2006	EXAMINER	
HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP 901 MAIN STREET, SUITE 3100 DALLAS, TX 75202			ROMANO, JOHN J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2192	

DATE MAILED: 06/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/087,384	Applicant(s) PEPPERS ET AL.	
	Examiner John J. Romano	Art Unit 2192	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 February 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 13-22 and 26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 13-22 and 26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's amendment and response received February 7th, 2006, responding to the November 2nd, 2005, Office action provided in the rejections of claims 1-9, 13-22 and 26, wherein claims 1 and 14 have been amended. Claims 1-9, 13-22 and 26, remain pending in the application and which have been fully considered by the examiner.

Applicant arguing for the claims being patentable over *Dodson and Kenyon* (see pages 7-9 of the amendment and response), and arguments pertaining to the dependent claims are not persuasive, as will be addressed under Prior Art's Arguments – Rejections section at item 2 and the claim rejections below. Accordingly, Applicants' amendment necessitated additional clarifications, in light of the rejection of the claims over prior art provided in the previous Office action, to further point out that the prior art also discloses as such claimed limitations as now amended which will be provided and/or addressed under the item 2 below. Thus, the rejection of the claims over prior art in the previous Office action is maintained in light of the necessitated additional clarifications provided hereon and **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 2192

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Prior Art's Arguments – Rejections

2. Applicant's arguments filed February 7th, 2006, in particular on page 7-8, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. For example,

(A) In regard to Applicant's arguments with respect to independent claims 1 and 14, that the *Dodson* patent alone, or in combination with *Kenyon et al*, do not teach "the program identifying an operating system manufacturer and version and determining if the version is older than a current required version" (page 7, third paragraph of the amendment and response), the Examiner respectfully disagrees. *Dodson* discloses:

- "Driver evaluator 215 is responsible for determining what drivers are installed in computer system 105, and what **versions of those drivers are installed**. Driver installer 220 is responsible for installing new drivers and **updating existing drivers selected** by master installer 205 that are obtained from driver source 140.", emphasis added (See Figure 2 & Column 2, lines 60-65).

Dodson further discloses in claim 11 (See Column 8, lines 6-8):

- "...comparing the **out-of-date driver** with a **current version** of the out-of-date driver to determine an updated component of the **current version of the out-of-date driver**", emphasis added.

So as to teach "determining if the version is older than a current required version", wherein a current version of an out-of-date driver is obviously a newer version and required.

The remaining limitation of the instant argument "the program identifying an operating system manufacturer and version...", is also taught by *Dodson* as disclosed:

- "This adaption is accomplished by selecting a validated driver stack **based on the platform version and the installed BIOS version** at block 725.", emphasis added (See *Dodson*, Figure 7 & Column 5, lines 50-53).

Wherein the BIOS version and platform version is clearly identified. Therefore, the instant limitation is indeed taught by *Dodson* and the rejection with respect to the instant argument is maintained.

(B) In response to Applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is invalid because "neither teaches or suggests providing the program identifying an operating system manufacturer and version and determining if the version is older than a current required version (page 8, second paragraph, of the amendment and response), the Examiner disagrees for at least the reasons given above, in section (A), with respect to *Dodson* teaching the respective limitation argued. Therefore, the rejections of claims 1 and 14 and their respective dependent claims are maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims **1-8, 13- 21** and **26** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dodson, US 6,513,159 B1 (art of record and hereinafter **Dodson**), and further in view of Killebrew et al., US 5,577,244 (hereinafter **Killebrew**).

1. In regard to claim **1**, **Dodson** discloses:

- *"A method for an automated operating system upgrade in an information handling system, from an older version to a newer version, comprising: preparing a target information handling system for an upgrade using an upgrade preparation program..."* (E.g., see Fig. 9 & Column 6, lines 7-14) wherein, the MBU interface prepares the system for the upgrade of the BIOS (operating system).
- *"...the program identifying the target system to determine whether a new operating system supports the target system..."* (E.g., see Fig. 7 & Column 5, lines 44-55) wherein, the platform (target system) is determined and compared to validate the BIOS upgrade or to determine whether it supports the target system.

- "...the program identifying an operating system manufacturer and version..." (E.g., see Fig. 9 & Column 6, lines 15-30) wherein a verified BIOS version is compared authenticated via a key infrastructure which is the equivalent of Applicant's operating system manufacturer.
- "...and determining if the version is older than a current required version..." (See Figure 2 & Column 2, lines 60-65), wherein a current version of an out-of-date driver is obviously a newer version and required.
- "...the program downloading the new operating system if required..." (E.g., see Fig. 8 (810) & Column 5, lines 59-61) wherein the BIOS is downloaded.
- "...copying the new operating system to a directory structure..." (E.g., see Fig. 8 (810) & Column 5, lines 59-61) wherein it is inherent that in order for the BIOS to be effectively upgraded the BIOS must be copied to the appropriate location (directory structure), wherein it is inherent that a directory structure is provided.
- "...the program scanning for all drivers on the target system ..." (E.g., see Fig. 2 (215) & Column 3, lines 2-8) wherein the drivers are identified (scanned) on the target system.
- "...the program downloading any additional required drivers to the new directory structure if needed to support the new operating system...." (E.g., see Fig. 2 (205) & Column 3, line 66 – Column 4, line 7) wherein

Master installer (the program) downloads any required drivers, which inherently are downloaded to the appropriate location or directory structure to be effective. Moreover, it is inherent that a driver, or a programming routine that links the operating system to a device, supports the operating system.

- *"...the program scanning to identify any factory installed software that are incompatible with the new operating system."* (E.g., see Fig. 2 (230) & Column 3, lines 21-23) wherein the package selector identifies any drivers (factory installed software) that need to be upgraded or are incompatible with the new operating system.

But **Dodson** does not expressly disclose *"...copying the new operating system to a directory structure..."* or *"...the program downloading any additional required drivers to the new directory structure if needed to support the new operating system...."*.

However **Killebrew** discloses:

- - *"...the program preparing a directory for any new drivers needed for operation of the new operating system."* (E.g., see Fig. 4 & Column 12, lines 18-24), wherein, a target director is created (prepared) for the new drivers needed for operation of the new operating system.

Dodson and **Killebrew** are analogous art because they are both concerned with the same field of endeavor, namely, an automated method for preparing to upgrade software. Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine **Killebrews'** target directory with

Dodsons' upgrade preparation process. The motivation was disclosed by **Dodson** (E.g., see Fig. 2 & Column 5, lines 4-25), wherein he teaches to inspect the current drivers, compare and replace them based on the hardware configuration. It would have been obvious to include a target director as it would be required as part of the installation. Furthermore, **Dodson** teaches "...a user friendly technique... which facilitates the updating of software programs..." (Column 1, lines 46-49), wherein, preparing the target directory, which is a necessary step in updating drivers, facilitates the updating of the programs. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to "*...the program preparing a directory for any new drivers needed for operation of the new operating system.*".

3. In regard to claim **2**, the rejections of base claim **1** are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Dodson** discloses:

- "...in response... the program prompting the target system for an approval to uninstall the incompatible software." (E.g., see Fig. 4 & Column 4, lines 13-23), wherein, the program prompts the user on the target system for approval to install the driver upgrade or uninstall the incompatible software.

4. In regard to claim **3**, the rejections of base claim **2** are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Dodson** discloses::

- "...in response to the approval, the program automatically uninstalling the incompatible software." (E.g., see Fig. 4 & Column 4, lines 22-23),

Art Unit: 2192

wherein installing upgraded drivers may include uninstalling the incompatible driver when necessary.

5. In regard to claim **4**, the rejections of base claim **2** are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Dodson** discloses:

- "...in response to a denial of the approval, the program advancing to a next step without uninstalling the incompatible software." (E.g., see Fig. 4 & Column 4, lines 13-23), wherein, the program advances to a next step without uninstalling the software if not approved.

6. In regard to claim **5**, the rejections of base claim **1** are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Dodson** discloses:

- "...the program comparing data received from the target system against a table." (E.g., see Fig. 2 & Column 3, lines 36-49), wherein, the known hardware of the system is compared with valid stacks, which is the equivalent of a table.

7. In regard to claim **6**, the rejections of base claim **5** are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Dodson** discloses:

- "...the table containing compatible results obtained from independent testing." (E.g., see Fig. 2 & Column 3, lines 36-49), wherein, the stacks are known to be valid wherein it is inherent that independent testing was performed in order to validate the stack.

8. In regard to claim **7**, the rejections of base claim **6** are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Dodson** discloses:

- *"...the program using results of the comparing to determine which applications and drivers of the target system are compatible with the new operating system."* (E.g., see Fig. 2& Column 3, lines 44-49), wherein, the package selector (230) selects the drivers that need to be installed or updated on the computer system, the drivers are compared against the valid stacks (table) and the drivers that should be installed are determined from that stack as a result of the comparing.

9. In regard to claim **8**, the rejections of base claim **6** are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Dodson** discloses:

- "...the program initiating removal of incompatible software."* (E.g., see Fig. 4 & Column 4, lines 13-23), wherein, the program initiates the installation of an upgrade and thus the removal of incompatible software.

10. In regard to claim **13**, the rejections of base claim **1** are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Dodson** discloses:

- *"...displaying upon a display device any current hardware information."* (E.g., see Fig. 4 & Column 4, lines 13-17), wherein the results of the hardware are displayed to the user.

11. As per claims **14-21** and **26**, this is a computer program product version of the claimed method discussed above, in claims **1**, **5-7** and **13**, wherein all claimed limitations have also been addressed and/or cited as set forth above, wherein **Dodson**

also discloses a computer readable storage medium storing "computer readable program code" (E.g. see, Figure 1 (145) & Column 2, lines 51-53).

12. Claims **9** and **22** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Dodson**, in view of **Killebrew** and further in view of Kenyon et al., US 2002/0100035 (hereinafter **Kenyon**).

13. In regard to claim **9**, the rejections of base claim **1** are incorporated. But **Dodson** does not expressly disclose "...driver include at least one of an audio driver, video driver, modem driver, and network driver.". However **Kenyon** discloses:

- "...driver include at least one of an audio driver, video driver, modem driver, and network driver." (E.g., see Figure 1a & Page 4, Paragraph [0044]), wherein audio, video and network drivers are upgraded.

The combined art of **Dodson and Killebrew** (hereinafter **the combined art**) and **Kenyan** are analogous art because they are both concerned with the same field of endeavor, namely, an automated method for preparing to upgrade software. Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine **Kenyans'** specific drivers with **the combined arts'** upgrade preparation process. The motivation was disclosed by **Dodson** (E.g., see Fig. 2 & Column 5, lines 4-25), wherein he teaches to inspect the current drivers, compare and replace them based on the hardware configuration. It would have been obvious to include a modem and network driver as Dodson's invention is performed on a distributed network and would thus require such drivers. Furthermore, **Dodson** teaches

"...to locate all installed hardware peripherals and drivers" (Column 3, lines 6-8), wherein any audio, video, network and modem drivers would be located and thus upgraded. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to include at least one of audio, video, modem or network driver in the driver upgrade.

14. As per claim **22**, this is a computer program product version of the claimed method discussed above, in claim **9**, wherein all claimed limitations have also been addressed and/or cited as set forth above, wherein **Dodson** also discloses a computer readable storage medium storing "computer readable program code" (E.g. see, Figure 1 (145) & Column 2, lines 51-53).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John J. Romano whose telephone number is (571) 272-3872. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5:30, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam can be reached on (571) 272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2192

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

JJR